

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

Table of Contents *Page*

Monday, September 10, 2012

ECA Assistant Secretary Report & Discussion Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs Ann Stock	2
Academic Programs Report & Discussion Deputy Assistant Secretary for Academic Programs Meghann Curtis	3
Academic Exchange Programs Report & Discussion Acting Office Director, Office of Academic Exchange Programs, Michelle Johnson	6

Tuesday, September 11, 2012

Introduction of Public Session Summary by Chairman Tom Healy of Board proceedings	8
Panel Discussion: “Who Wouldn’t Go After a Fulbright?!: Recruiting Top Scholars in a Changing World” Ms. Neera Tanden, President and CEO of the Center for American Progress, Moderator Dr. Cornelius Kerwin, President, American University Dr. Zeke Emanuel, Vice Provost for Global Initiatives, University of Pennsylvania Dr. Jeanne Tounghara, Vice Provost for International Programs, Howard University Dr. Mark Weiss, Director of the Division of Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences, National Science Foundation	8

**J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012**

The 256th meeting of the J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board took place in Washington, DC on September 10-11, 2012 at the American Pharmacists Association.

Members in attendance at the quarterly Board meeting were: Chairman Tom Healy, Vice Chair Susan Ness and Members, Rye Barcott, Betty Castor, Gabriel Guerra-Mondragón, and Shelby Lewis. Participating only on September 11 were: Members Mark Alexander, Lisa Caputo, and Anita McBride. Excused was: Member Christie Gilson.

Monday, September 10, 2012

ECA Assistant Secretary Report & Discussion

Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs Ann Stock

At 1:01 pm the closed session was recessed and the open session began with Chairman Healy introducing Assistant Secretary Ann Stock. A/S Stock reported on her attendance at the Fulbright Association annual prize dinner, where the prize was given to Doctors Without Borders. Vice Chair Ness added that this prize is given every year and one of the things the Board would like to do is to increase cooperation between the Fulbright Association and the Fulbright Board. A/S Stock noted that she thinks there is great room for more cross-fertilization and working together.

A/S Stock noted the number of Fulbrighters moving at the end of the summer to and from countries, as well as the Board's role in selecting Fulbrighters. A/S Stock thanked the Board for examining the application review process because it is so critical to protecting the integrity of the program and making sure that the right people go to the areas we need them. A/S Stock also acknowledged that many Board members spoke at Pre-Departure Orientations (PDOs). A/S Stock discussed the Virtual Pre-Departure Orientations (VPDOs) and noted this was an exciting new tool which will be demonstrated to the Board later in the meeting during a closed session.

A/S Stock noted that the new Fulbright Public Policy Fellows recently came through Washington to meet with Secretary Clinton, Under Secretary Sonenshine and host government embassies. ECA will be following their progress very closely and checking in with them often to see how this new program is developing.

A/S Stock reported that ECA was excited by the follow-up to the Board's "Fulbright in a Connected World" panel from June and a working group to follow up on those initiatives will be presenting to the Board later in the meeting in closed session.

A/S Stock also reported about status on the recent U.S Strategic Dialogues with other countries, and what those partnerships mean for Fulbright. A/S Stock discussed developments with India, Indonesia and Libya.

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

A/S Stock discussed the ECA strategic planning process and how one of ECA's key roles is as a convener and facilitator of international connections. ECA brought over 450 higher education leaders, university admissions officers, and State Department advisors together through the EducationUSA Forum to discuss strategies for attracting foreign students to U.S. colleges and universities. During International Education Week this November ECA will be putting together a huge virtual college fair with 200 universities participating.

A/S Stock noted that facilitating connections is done through Fulbright Commissions all over the world. As educational mobility has a bigger role to play, the Fulbright program becomes more and more important. The program is dynamic, growing and has a great story to tell – which through the new storytelling initiatives ECA can begin to tell in a different way.

Ambassador Guerra-Mondragón questioned where ECA stood in the complex budget process. A/S Stock noted that there is no confirmed budget yet for FY13, but over the past couple of years ECA has made a concerted effort to talk to the Hill about what the Bureau is doing, why we're doing it and about public diplomacy efforts in general. One of the components that is helpful is to get Fulbrighters themselves on the Hill talking about their exchange experience. A/S Stock noted that Board travel domestically has also helped with Congressional outreach. A/S Stock discussed her upcoming travel to Africa.

Academic Programs Report & Discussion

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Academic Programs Meghann Curtis

Chairman Healy introduced DAS Meghann Curtis, noting that the Board did not have enough time planned for DAS Curtis's presentation at the June meeting and would like to make sure she knows she has plenty of time today. DAS Curtis noted there was a potential increase in the Senate mark-up for the FY13 budget, which would be the first increase in a number of years, but it's still early going and might not happen.

DAS Curtis discussed her recent travel to Colombia and Ecuador and the interest in both countries was specifically about English language learning and teaching. DAS Curtis discussed challenges related to diversity in both recruitment and placement for both countries. DAS Curtis discussed government funded programs in both countries to send more students to the U.S. – and the challenges those programs face.

DAS Curtis discussed the strategic planning process for ECA/A, which is a part of the process that feeds into the greater ECA planning process. ECA/A is using the principles from the ECA process and digging down into each program. DAS Curtis noted that many of the "core" Fulbright programs were designed 60 years ago, and so the challenge now is to examine them in our dramatically changing world to see how the programs are meeting new challenges and/or can be improved. As a result of a SWOT analysis and the rest of the planning process, ECA/A is now running six visioning groups asking program officers to feed up ideas of how to take our programs in a new direction. These groups will be meeting

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

throughout September and will include outside experts. DAS Curtis invited the Board to participate in these meetings, or offered to share the findings with the Board. Following the visioning groups, there will be a more extensive program review, taking each program and evaluating it completely. DAS Curtis noted that Board participation and input would be welcomed on the reviews of the Fulbright student and scholar program and she would be in touch regarding details on that.

DAS Curtis indicated that she was looking forward to the panel the Board had planned for Tuesday to discuss the Scholar Program. ECA/A has engaged with CIES and IIE to organize a study of cost of living and assess whether the stipend rates for visiting students and scholars are sufficient for the program. CIES is also completing a comparability study to look at other fellowships for US scholars who go overseas to see how Fulbright ranks in terms of stipends, flexibility, length of time, etc. So that data will help inform some of the programmatic decisions.

DAS Curtis described the Public Policy Fellows who recently left on their Fulbright grants and indicated they were trying to bring in some new countries for next year – possibly Burma and some more countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

DAS Curtis noted that NEXUS II was coming up this fall and an excellent lead scholar, Daniel Kammen, has been selected. Right now the applications for the grantees have been received and the time for selection is close. This is a model for the Scholar program, which may tie back to the program evaluation discussion. This type of program is more resource-intensive but has been highly successful. DAS Curtis invited a representative from the Board to attend the kick-off meeting scheduled for November in Banff, Canada.

DAS Curtis noted another area that ECA/A was working on was how to leverage open educational resources. This is a huge question in higher education right now. DAS Curtis encouraged the Board to not just talk about Fulbright but also about the potential of MOOCs, Massively Open Online Courses. Under the auspices of the Fulbright Specialists program, ECA has encouraged the field to request specialists in OER to utilize these more around the world in endless ways.

DAS Curtis noted that two cables have gone or are about to go out to the field: one on the Same Sex Domestic Partner policy and the other on crisis response. She passed out a draft copy of the SSDP policy cable which was not yet fully cleared. The second was prompted by complications with working on various crises – Arab Spring and other in-country crises – and provides posts and commissions with clear guidance on how emergencies should be handled with respect to the Fulbright program. DAS Curtis also noted ECA was in the process of developing standard guidance on sexual harassment and sexual assault. Lastly DAS Curtis noted a memo that is not ready yet but should be by the end of the Board meeting on gift solicitation.

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

Chairman Healy asked how the Board's input into the review process might be formalized to engage the Board in the most useful way. DAS Curtis recommended that the Board could sit in on the visioning group reports or at least have a phone conference for those. DAS Curtis noted that the big part that should be formalized was including the Board in the formal program review.

Ms. Castor asked for more information on the Public Policy Fellowships to be sent to the entire Board. Ms. Johnson noted that information on that could be sent to the Board that night. Vice Chair Ness questioned when it would be possible to send Fulbrighters to Burma. DAS Curtis noted that they were already discussing the issue to see when it would be possible. Ambassador Guerra-Mondragón asked about the timing of the program reviews and DAS Curtis responded that perhaps ECA could time it to sync with the next Board meeting on November 14.

DAS Curtis noted ECA's activities for International Education Week, including the largest virtual college fair ever and a partnership with NAFSA for a panel discussion to highlight U.S. schools that have done a good job to internationalize their campuses.

Dr. Lewis asked if ECA/A was talking to other groups and governments on these efforts, for example the British Council. DAS Curtis responded affirmatively and gave some details about efforts to connect with such organizations in Ecuador, in Colombia, in Libya, etc.

Chairman Healy asked if there had been thought given to how the work of Fulbrighters could be content for OERs. DAS Curtis noted that this was something they need to think more about in the program review. There is an argument that anything that is government funded should be openly licensed under creative commons but this has to be fully and frankly discussed during the program reviews because there are a lot of implications, especially in the scientific realm. Chairman Healy noted that many scholars would not have their own reach – are not famous – but the Fulbright name could add that in this space.

Mr. Barcott asked how ECA was consulting Alec Ross and the greater Department of State innovation experts in these efforts. DAS Curtis noted that ECA has a great working relationship on these issues and works with them closely.

Chairman Healy noted that the Board had moved their fourth quarter meeting to be during International Education Week (IEW) at ECA's request and asked what roles the Board would have to fit into the ECA programming that week. DAS Curtis discussed the Open Doors report which tallies the number of international students that are studying in the U.S. and number of American who study abroad. A/S Stock noted some of the trends and numbers from last year's report. DAS Curtis assured the Board that ECA would take advantage of the Board during IEW. There was some more discussion about last year's Open Doors numbers.

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

Academic Exchange Programs Report & Discussion

Acting Office Director, Office of Academic Exchange Programs, Michelle Johnson

Ms. Johnson began by introducing Wes Carrington, who is the new Branch Chief for Europe and Eurasia and Mary Kirk who will be joining the office in two weeks as the new Office Director for the Office of Academic Exchange Programs. Ms. Johnson noted that Ms. Kirk was at the meeting to listen in on the discussions as a preview for starting soon.

Ms. Johnson discussed some of the policy issues that the Board is scheduled to take up in private session on Tuesday and address some issues that were left over from the June meeting. One of these issues is the flexibility in grant length for scholars. Right now the preferred length for scholar programs according to the regulations is eight to ten months. One-term or semester stays are okay, but anything less than two months needs special approval from the Board, with a few exceptions. Ms. Johnson asked the Board to consider whether there were other categories that may allow the program to engage target audiences or where there may be additional flexibility.

Chairman Healy asked about the numbers in each category, as he has been surprised at how many people are not doing eight to ten month programs. Additionally he added that he thinks a key ingredient in this discussion is if there is a floor amount below which something is no longer a Fulbright – i.e., if it's too short a trip, it becomes an issue of diluting the Fulbright brand and Fulbright experience. Ambassador Guerra-Mondragón asked what the minimum and maximum length currently was. Ms. Johnson noted that with some exceptions the minimum is two months. The average is probably a one-semester award, and the longest is an academic year. The Board discussed the Specialist program and some of the challenges in recruitment for the Scholar program. Ms. Johnson previewed what she expected to come out of the panel discussion on Tuesday, based on previous conversations on the topic of the Scholar program.

Ms. Johnson noted that one of the issues that was sidelined at the June meeting was the issue of lifetime limits to various categories of awards, specifically the Specialist program. Ms. Johnson explained some of the background of the Specialist program and noted that because of the lifetime limits what has actually happened is that the intention of becoming a feeder program has not worked because of the potential that it will limit the possibility of a future Fulbright award.

Ms. Johnson noted that in many ways the specialist program is really about scholars serving in a service capacity – they are not pursuing their own individual research agendas, they have been called to complete a specific project of service to benefit the host country. The people who have been Fulbrighters before and have maxed out on their lifetime numbers are often the very people who are most in demand and would be most useful in these awards. There was discussion of a specific scholar from Chile.

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

Chairman Healy asked what would be most helpful in discussing this issue – a proposal for the Board to vote on or a full program review? Ms. Johnson noted that she could work with the Board Staff to develop a proposal to be considered by the Board for a vote, but a quick way could be to amend the regulations to have the Specialist program exempt from the lifetime limits.

Ms. Johnson noted that another issue that the Board will discuss in closed session on Tuesday is the issue of Americans who are dual citizens who are applying to be Fulbrighters in the country of their dual citizenship. Ms. Johnson noted there were a couple of reasons this was problematic, and that it was only a problem with Americans going overseas on the U.S. student and scholar programs, due to U.S. visa regulations. There has never been a formal policy on this but there are a few cases every year and it's becoming more problematic to not know the Board's opinion on this issue. Ms. Johnson described the differences in how this issue was handled in different countries, as outlined in a background paper provided to the Board. Specific cases in Italy, Mexico and Russia were discussed. Some of the problem is in optics and in regard to the program's goal to increase mutual understanding.

Chairman Healy noted that he had been confused by the background material and would like to see these type of issues framed in a pro/con way and to be clear whether the Board should be discussing this issue today with an eye toward a vote today or in the future. Chairman Healy asked why the policy needs to be different than what it is currently. Ms. Johnson noted that the change would be a clarification. The policies do not actually say anything about passport or nationality. The policies currently say that in order to receive a Fulbright award a candidate must have a passport and be able to get a visa. They do not specify that for U.S. citizens on the U.S. program, every effort should be made to get a visa in their American passport. The Board discussed some additional specific cases. Ms. Johnson noted that the Board also could say that they think it's fine to continue as is and offered several outcomes from the discussion.

Ms. Hahs noted that this issue was really about nationality in her opinion, not the passport. The passports are a piece of it but it may really be about dual nationals applying to go to the other country of their citizenship on Fulbright. Chairman Healy asked Ms. Johnson to make a recommendation as to what they would like the Board to specifically consider. Vice Chair Ness asked Ms. Johnson to try to track these cases and see if there is an increasing trend in them, which may need to be discussed in a different way. Chairman Healy noted that an annotated policy book for the Board's eyes only may help to record some of this history.

Ms. Johnson noted that one additional question is to specify when a Fulbright award becomes a Fulbright award. This comes up because of a health crisis or other perfectly legitimate reason for early curtailment. If this is counted as having a Fulbright then that person can not reapply (for a student award). Chairman Healy asked if this could also be drafted up in a way that this could be voted on by the Board when it's introduced to the Board.

**J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012**

Mr. Harsha introduced the regional review assignments for the coming year and asked for feedback if there were any major changes requested.

Tuesday, September 11, 2012

**Introduction of Public Session
Chairman Tom Healy**

Panel Discussion:

“Who Wouldn’t Go After a Fulbright?!: Recruiting Top Scholars in a Changing World”

- **Ms. Neera Tanden, President and CEO of the Center for American Progress , Moderator**
- **Dr. Cornelius Kerwin, President, American University (AU)**
- **Dr. Zeke Emanuel, Vice Provost for Global Initiatives, University of Pennsylvania (*via video link*)**
- **Dr. Jeanne Tougara, Vice Provost for International Programs, Howard University**
- **Dr. Mark Weiss, Director of the Division of Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences, National Science Foundation**

Dr. Kerwin was the first panelist to present stating that it is important for Fulbright to encourage universities like AU to continue to provide an organizational focus on the campuses for the Fulbright work, and to ensure that, for those institutions to take it seriously, to see that it is properly staffed, and that relationships between staff and program staff are strong. Dr. Kerwin noted that the program had some challenges with competition for the fellows program including the immense impact of technology and the ability of individual faculty members to develop networks for their teaching and of institutions losing their grip on this phenomena. Fulbright must find a way to penetrate these networks in order to further promote the program and advance the face-to-face and human contact that it brings. Another challenge is the rise of issue-area and regional focused centers and institutes that bring faculty together in those fields, these centers are emitting out from campuses the individual networks for these scholars to then reach out to their own contacts to both come to that institute as well as send faculty abroad in a more informal way.

Another challenge Dr. Kerwin noted was the timing of a grant for younger faculty who don’t have tenure, but are at a critical stage in their career development. To combat this there needs to be an acknowledgement for more mature faculty members that opportunities are there for them and that the Fulbright format and history is superior to some of the individually-based opportunities that they may find

Dr. Kerwin closed his opening remarks with two final points: 1) to reach out to national educational associations that take special interest in the global impact of American higher

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

education (ex. American Council on Education, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities) and 2) to reach out to discipline-based associations (ex. American Political Science Association, American Society for Public Administration, the Academy of Management) who can identify younger and more mature scholars who are looking for opportunities abroad.

Dr. Weiss gave opening remarks next, noting that Fulbright is very urgent and important, especially in the interdisciplinary nature of the sciences and the collaborative work among scientists should ideally increase the level of engagement of scientists with Fulbright. Dr. Weiss noted that NSF is heavily reliant on “rotators;” scientists who leave their home institution for a year or two at a time- they face many of the same issues Fulbrighters do (ex. family issues, oversight of lab and grad students/postdocs). NSF has developed a program that might serve as models Fulbright might consider for their Scholars which gives flexibility for return trips home during the grant period, providing for a postdoc or grad student to join them for a short time – the grad student/postdoc would be especially helpful, as this can further create collaboration for the future. Dr. Weiss suggested that Fulbright strongly encourage applicants to think about the award as a building block- not a single entity, but a means of beginning collaboration for the remainder of one’s career- building relationships for potential future opportunities

Dr. Toungara opened with remarks that Fulbright is an excellent investment of taxpayer money- it provides support to scholars and a layer of security that many other programs do not. She noted that many Scholars in the African American community are unaware of Fulbright and the opportunities that are available to them- they often think it is for people already doing international research. The Fulbright program must find ways to promote knowledge of Fulbright to ALL communities, encouraging them to explore how they might get such an opportunity and that it should also encourage scholars who will teach American studies and culture abroad. Dr. Toungara noted that this community may be more challenged than others, as they are very much more affected by local economic and political trends, as they may be in areas where Fulbright has less reach. In addition, there must be greater support for management of finances for those with families- many universities are not making up the full salary difference for faculty abroad, so that they can continue with mortgages, etc.

Dr. Toungara noted that the Fulbright program needs more support from university administration: faculty often seem to be on their own, as institutions do not have policies in their handbooks on how to make this work properly and administrators need more training on how best they can provide for their scholars both going abroad, as well as visiting from elsewhere. She noted that many faculty members do not know how to go about getting a letter of affiliation abroad – especially those who have never been abroad, they do not know where to start, and don’t have the expertise within their home institution. The program should find more and better ways to engage alumni in order to fully promote the Fulbright programs and noted that these alumni can also help find people to reach out to, people who

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

might consider applying for a Fulbright, who can then write them letter of recommendation, they can also help the applicants find the letter of affiliation from abroad.

Dr. Emanuel noted that more flexibility in grant length/terms of grant are key and that those in two-career families with young children may not be able to all go abroad for six months at a time – a possible solution is to allow for perhaps one month, then a return, then two months at a time, etc, to permit those with families to accept a grant. He explained that there needs to be more flexibility for group projects and collaboration among scholars and universities – it would be natural to have two- or three-week project blocks to plan for in-depth meetings and collaboration for a group of faculty from multiple universities in more than one location who will be working together intensively for perhaps a year or more. Dr. Emanuel noted that he thought Fulbright should move away from having the model of one faculty member working alone, rather than a team for group research projects.

Dr. Tounagara agreed with Dr. Emanuel, saying she never considered Fulbright for anything related to a group project. She mentioned the Fulbright Specialist Program, indicating its short span of two to six weeks, and how that can assist with short-term participants and that this really fits into the situation that many people have who cannot stay away from home for an extended period of time, but still want the opportunity. She mentioned that the bureau used to have a university relations office for partnership programs, and this was effective in supporting this sort of engagement for collaboration.

Dr. Emanuel commented that two to six week exchanges do not permit for repeated interaction, which is key to programs like this, and the interpersonal interaction really makes these exchanges what they are – this repeated, sustained interaction needs to be promoted for such programs to be successful.

Dr. Kerwin noted that this flexibility is key when it comes to universities and exchanges, and the creation and growth of long-term working relationships is vital to the growth of any program to have the ability to bring people together in such a way and allow that natural interactive process to be able to play out accordingly – Fulbright can contribute to the emergence of this collaboration.

Dr. Weiss noted the development of thematic programs would also be hugely beneficial for collaborating institutions on both sides of the border – developing a network of relationships for individual scholars to be able to plug into that would then extend to the next generation of researchers. He added that flexibility of the structure of awards would be particularly beneficial.

Dr. Kerwin said adequate support from the host institution is a key to keeping families together during grants – they need to be available to assist in transition. He agreed that alumni support is beneficial for scholars who are applying

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

Ms. Tanden noted a question from the audience regarding the issue of support and how this is an impediment for many - is there a way to offer fewer, but larger grants to scholars in order to offset the financial burden?

Dr. Tounagara suggested that someone should compile a how-to guide and make it accessible for Scholars, what to do about house, children, etc. She said this is the core of individual exchange – children and families experiencing such things – this is one of the essential elements of the original program and this makes us better citizens, gives us better communities to share and experience.

Meghann Curtis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State agreed that these are many of the issues that are being grappled with, and this is why recruiting for the Scholar Program is so difficult. She noted that State is looking at ways to develop such programs for long-term exposure.

Ms. Tanden acknowledged another question from the audience regarding consideration being given to the creation of a “subject to assignment” category, perhaps only asking for a continent, noting the belief that one must have a prior connection to the host country before applying.

Dr. Weiss said NSF has programs for preliminary trips to a country in order to make initial connections for future work.

Dr. Kerwin noted that scholars need to take responsibility to create relationships on their own to support their research and he would suggest to a faculty member that they look somewhere else if he was told they wanted to go somewhere with no connections.

Dr. Tounagara said networking is so important for this process, to find out where scholars are, in order to create these relationships – we must use resources we have.

Chairman Tom Healy asked a question to Dr. Emanuel: what space should Fulbright occupy? Is there a place that nobody else is occupying where we can be?

Dr. Emanuel said it is unclear as to where the resources are going to come from and emphasized that when funds are distributed internally there should be cross-school collaboration for resources. He said Fulbright should be trying to foster more faculty-to-faculty collaboration and that the more diverse perspectives that are brought about greatly improve this collaboration.

Ms. Tanden asked should we rethink any aspects of a Fulbright scholarship with the advent of Skype and other ways of globalizing information that were not available in the past?

Mary Ellen Schneider, Executive Director of the Fulbright Association noted she had been a Fulbrighter in Macedonia in 2005-6, and was invited back recently to work on a new

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

program- this was the first time since the Balkan Wars that the Croats, Serbians, Montenegrins, Albanians, and Macedonians had collaborated on such a project. They had been collaborating via the internet for two years, and then met for the first time in person – they had all been to the U.S. on a Fulbright in the past.

Chairman Healy noted the Board must find a unique way to find space for these type of continuing interactions and collaborations in the Scholar side of the program that we offer.

Dr. Emanuel said flexibility for projects is also important – one can't always fit their research into a specific square hole and that rigorous criteria is important for deep collaboration and scholarship, but high quality work also comes from being able to define one's project and to attract a senior scholar.

Dr. Kerwin noted that pilot projects like this can bring about some really cutting edge work with interesting results, both in terms of who responds and what sort of issues are brought forward.

Dr. Weiss noted that Fulbright concentrating in the interdisciplinary international sphere would not be unique, as many other agencies and organizations already do this.

Dr. Emanuel said the face-to-face interaction is really key, that can never be replaced by any sort of technology.

An audience member asked with the huge numbers of adjunct faculty in universities, does this affect Fulbright numbers and people being able to go abroad, especially for a longer term grant? Dr. Kerwin indicated that this was not the case at AU, while the other panelists had no data on the matter. Dr. Toungara indicated that those people might consider applying as individuals, rather than through the university where they are an adjunct.

An audience member said that as a faculty member at a junior college, there is no support from their home university, and personal leave would have to be taken, and no benefits would be offered- is this situation unusual? Is there information about this available? Dr. Kerwin addressed this; talking about the need for deans to share this information with faculty, and then the financial management at the individual institutions

Board Member Mark Alexander said the Board is aware that they cannot fund entire salaries and benefits for those abroad, and is always trying to find ways to further support. Board Member Anita McBride added there is a huge need to bring in non-traditional universities, like community colleges and to figure out how to grow this accessibility. DAS Curtis added that more visiting scholars come to community colleges now, because of greater access and opportunities that exist but there needs to be greater outreach to university administrators by saying “this is not just for the good of your professor, but the good of your campus, and the good of your country” and administrators need to understand global citizenship and embrace it.

J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board
Minutes of the 256th Quarterly Meeting
Washington, DC
September 10-11, 2012

Dr. Toungara said there should be committees/task forces that work together to determine targeted topical areas for research – they don't always need to be scientific. She noted that STEM is always a priority, but there needs to be collaborative research on other topics as well, e.g., African diasporas and fine arts.

Dr. Kerwin said the New Century Scholars program did just this – collaborative efforts in specific topics, but this was suspended, due to its expense. He said that the best funder for exchanges of these types in his opinion is USAID because of their continuing funding of university linkages. A Fulbrighter should be able to join this team, if one exists at their university – that kind of collaboration would make sense. People need to be creative when dealing with various grants and programs – they should be willing to work together to help promote mutual exchanges. Fulbright has more than one niche, and does so many different things that people don't know about. There are other agencies with similar niches, and putting them together makes them stronger. People must do some research and get creative.